



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/924,158	08/07/2001	Keyvan Sayyah	B-3927CIP 618935-7	1825

7590

04/03/2003

LADAS & PARRY
Suite 2100
5670 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90036-5679

EXAMINER

LE, THAO P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2818

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/924,158

Applicant(s)

SAYYAH, KEYVAN

Examiner

Thao P Le

Art Unit

2818

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Examiner took notice of remarks made on 03/04/03. However, it is found not persuasive. The election/restriction's traverse on the ground that species I and II are not distinct and therefore should not be restricted. Species I and II disclose two different methods. Species I (claims 1-21) and II (claims 22-34) disclose the method for transferring circuit elements from one substrate to another. However, the transferring in species I can be different from the transferring in species II. The transferring (in species I) can involve techniques, for example, lift-off, removing, or etching the original substrate, and it doesn't have to involve the use of vibration and gravity as disclosed in species II. The transferring disclosed in species II requires the use of gravitational forces and vibrational energy to place the element from one substrate to another. Any element can be applied in species II and doesn't have to be in a conical frustum-shaped configuration and doesn't have to have electrically conductive contacts on its surface, and the receptor substrate doesn't have to have a sloping side walls and being sized to receive the element. Two species are distinct and the previous restriction was proper. Therefore, the election/restriction is made FINAL.

Claim objection

2. Claims 22, 25 are objected to due to misspelling "gravational forces" should have changed to ---gravitational forces ---
3. Claims 22-34 was selected and presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ma et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,651,176.

Regarding to claim 22, Ma et al. discloses the method of transferring individual element from a substrate to another substrate using vibrational energy. It would have been inherent that the transfer involving gravitational force. See Abstract, Cols. 1-12 and Fig.1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2818

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 23-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,651,176.

Regarding to claims 23-27, it would have been obvious in the art that the element and receptor would have had a truncated cones shape and the circuit elements include a pixel. Regarding to claim 25, it would have been inherent that the transfer would assume an incline attitude as an aid to the gravitational forces in placing the individual elements in receptors formed in the different substrate.

Regarding to claims 28-34, it would have been obvious in the art to use electrically conductive contacts or resin formed in receptor and apply voltage and of measuring of the current pulse for each receptor.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thao P Le whose telephone number is 703-605-1187. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T (8:00-6:30).

Application/Control Number: 09/924,158
Art Unit: 2818

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on 703-308-4910. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.



Thao Phuong Le
March 24, 2003



HOAI HO
PRIMARY EXAMINER